

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Additionally, the drawings and portions of the specification have been objected to.

Objection to Drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

Figure 3 of the drawings has been objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, the Examiner has noted that reference sign 68 in Figure 3 is not mentioned in the description. He has required correction.

In response, Applicant is amending paragraphs on pages 7 and 8 of the specification so that the reference numerals mentioned in the specification match those found in Figures 3 and 4. Applicant submits that no new matter is being introduced by way of this amendment. Applicant's amendment merely corrects two typographical errors.

Objection to Informality in Specification

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of the presence of an informality in a date found in the paragraph spanning pages 3 and 4 in the specification. In response, Applicant is amending the specification herein, as required, to correct the informality.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 under 36 USC § 103(a) over Kozuki

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 stand rejected for obviousness over the Kozuki, et al. reference. The Examiner considers Kozuki to disclose a recorder/player (306), a central processing unit for controlling the recording/playback systems (303), and a video signal source for providing a video source (301), and a video signal transmission system (307-311) in Figure 7. He also considers Kozuki to disclose a video signal switching system (305) responsive to commands from the central processor unit for selectively distributing the video signal to the recorder/player (306), the display

monitor (311) and the transmission system (311), wherein a full motion video signal may be distributed to the recorder/player (306) while a selected still frame of the video signal is distributed to other components (313) of the system (col. 2, lines 14-19). The Examiner admits that Kozuki does not disclose a video signal display monitor. However, he considers Kozuki to disclose a television signal from output 311 implying that the output can be connected to a video signal display monitor. He considers that it would have been highly desirable to have a video signal display monitor so that the signals could be viewed. Therefore, he concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a video signal display monitor for Kozuki's arrangement.

Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant submits that the Examiner misreads many of the components described in Kozuki. In fact, several of the claimed elements are not described or suggested at all by Kozuki. First, claim 1 recites a central processing unit for controlling the recording/playback system. Without elaboration, the Examiner simply states that Kozuki's system contains a central processing unit for controlling the recording/playback system. Applicant submits that there is no central processing unit disclosed and no disclosure or suggestion of any structure that performs the controlling function recited. Rather, camera signal processing circuit 303 is merely described as receiving an electrical signal via preamplifier 302 (col. 7, lines 44-46) and being connected to the memory 312 so that information for one picture is memorized (col. 8, lines 5-7). There is nothing that suggests that the camera signal processing unit 303 or Kozuki's system as a whole is controlled by a central processing unit or other controller.

In addition, the video signal switching system recited in claim 1 is not found or suggested by Kozuki. According to claim 1, the claimed system includes a video signal switching system that

is responsive to commands from the central processor unit for selectively distributing the video signal to the recorder/player, display monitor and transmission system. The Examiner points to the switching circuit 305 of Kozuski as providing this claimed element. According to Kozuski, however, the switching circuit 305 does not perform this function. At most, the switching circuit 305 selectively provides a video signal to the recording circuit 306. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the switching circuit 305 provides any signal to a display monitor or to a transmission system. Kozuski explains that the analog video signal is supplied to a recording/reproducing circuit 306 via the switching circuit 305. Col. 7, lines 50-52. A digital signal is supplied to the switching circuit 305 through the recording/reproduction selecting switch 310 and then recorded on magnetic tape by the recording/reproducing circuit 306. Col. 7, lines 60-65. Further, the switching circuit 305 is not responsive to commands from a central processing unit, as claim 1 recites.

Because at least these two elements are not disclosed or suggested by Kozuki, claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 5-6, which depend from claim 1, should be allowable over this reference.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Kozuki and Cooper

Claims 4 and 7 stand rejected for obviousness over a combination of Kozuki with the Cooper patent. The Examiner considers Kozuki to disclose a second mode for transmitting full motion video signals as a playback of the recorded full motion video signal from the recorder/player (col. 7, line 39 to col. 8, line 4). He admits, however, that Kozuki does not disclose a first mode. The Examiner considers Cooper to disclose transmitting full motion video in a first mode as the full motion video is generated by the video signal source (col. 5, lines 24-28). He considers that it would have been high desirable to have a first mode so that the full motion video can be viewed as it occurs. Therefore, he considers it to have been obvious to have combined Kozuki with Cooper.

Applicant again traverses the rejection. First, Applicant incorporates here the arguments made above with reference to independent claim 1 and submits that claim 4 should be allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim. Secondly, Applicant contends that the proposed combination of Kozuki and Cooper is improper. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. MPEP 2143.01. Applicant points out that there is no suggestion in either of the cited references to make the proposed modification to Kozuki's system. The Examiner has also made no showing that such a motivation or suggestion would have existed in the art that would teach one of skill in art to make the proposed combination at the time of the invention.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Kozuki and Fujita

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected for obviousness over a combination of Kozuki with Fujita. The Examiner admits that Kozuki does not disclose a marking signal generator. However, he considers Fujita to disclose a marking signal generator (201) for selecting still frames of the recorded full motion video to be marked (col. 9, lines 60-65) in Figure 1.

Applicant again traverses the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness. Because they depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 8 and 9 should be allowable at least for the reasons that claim 1 is. Further, however, Applicant submits that neither Fujita nor Kozuki disclose additional elements set forth in claims 8 and 9. Fujita does not describe or suggest claim 8's recitation of selecting frames for distribution of the recorded marked frames by a video switching system. As

explained previously, Kozuki does not describe or suggest the claimed video switching system element either. Applicant urges the Examiner to remove the rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Kozuki and Freeman

Claim 10 stands rejected for obviousness over a combination of Kozuki with Freeman. The Examiner admits that Kozuki does not disclose that the CPU is a Pentium-class processor. However, he notes that Freeman discloses a video transmission device using a PC and that it is well known in the art that PC's often use Pentium-class processors. Therefore, he considers it obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a Pentium class processor used in Kozuki's system.

Applicant traverses the rejection. As noted previously, there is no indication that Kozuki's system needs or can use a processor. There is no suggestion or motivation pointed to by the Examiner for making the asserted combination of Kozuki and Freeman, and, because Kozuki's system apparently does not make use of a controller or processor, Applicant submits that there is no such suggestion in the art. Applicant submits that claim 10 is non-obvious over the asserted combination.

Added Claims 11-20

Applicant is adding herein claims 11-20 which further define and claim various aspects of the present invention. The added claims encompass additional features including audio and data signal sources.

PETITION FOR ONE MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant petitions for a one month extension of time pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a) in order to submit the present response. A fee in the amount of \$110.00 is included herewith for the cost of the petition.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: SEPT. 27, 2001

Shawn Hunter
Reg. No. 36,168
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.
P. O. Box 61389
Houston, Texas 77208-1389
(713) 221-3305
Attorney for Applicant

PORTION OF SPECIFICATION REPLACED SHOWING CHANGES MADE

In the paragraph spanning pages 3 and 4 of the specification, the following changes were made:

-- The versatility of the system of the subject invention permits transmission of the full motion image both in real time, or as a played back recording, as well as still frames of selected images and burst modes. The burst mode is a selection of sequential still images over a selected time frame. For example, assuming a target is identified and destroyed, it may be desirable to select a sequential series of still images at specific timed intervals, e.g. every one-fourth of a second, for five seconds before and twenty seconds after destruction, while at the same time simultaneously recording the full image on tape without interruption. The burst mode is more fully described in my co-pending application entitled: Video and Data Capture and Retrieval Surveillance System for Aircraft, Serial No. 08/729,139, filed on October 11, 1996; Acoustic Catastrophic Detection and Data Capture and Retrieval System for Aircraft; Serial No. 08/738,487, filed on October 28, 1996[1] and Wireless Transducer Data Capture and Retrieval System for Aircraft, Serial No. 08/745,536, filed on November 12, 1996 and incorporated by reference herein.--

The following changes were made to the paragraph replaced on page 7 of the specification:

-- The video switching module 50 is housed in the interface unit 14. Switch A in the video switching module 50 permits selection between any of a plurality of video sensors such as video sensors A and B, as shown. These may be manually selected via the remote control unit 16, or programmed selection may be utilized as programmed at the central processing unit 10. A controller module 52 receives the control and selection signal input on the data line 54 which is an RS-232 data

line connected to data port 4 of the central processing unit. The processor video input select switch B is also provided in the video switching module and is controlled by the controller 52 and selects the sensor sources or the recorder/player output for capture/processing/storage/transmission. A display monitor input select switch C is also provided for selecting either the recorder/player unit output on line [56] 68 or the processing unit output on line 58.--

The following changes were made to the paragraph found on page 8 of the specification:

-- An alternative embodiment is shown in Fig. 4 and incorporates an MIL-STD-1553 data bus for connecting the display 21, the GPS and/or other data signal modules 40 and the radio and data controller 48 to the system. The radio interphone system 60 is also expanded to include additional audio channels. A VDU input matrix module 62 is provided for controlling the various video input signals to the cockpit integrated display 21. This is controlled by the platform controller computer [70] 64 which is also connected to the display 21 and the processor unit 10 by the MIL-STD-1553 data bus.--